DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 569 95 CE 002 930

TITLE	Programmed Instructional Materials for Adult Basic Education: An Empirically-Based Evaluation of Materials Developed by the Adult Learning Center. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh. Adult Learning Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Adult Education Programs.
BUREAU NO	432028
PUB DATE	Nov 72
GRANT	OEG-0-70-4599(324)
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; *Educational Programs; Home Management; Jobs; Money Management; *Programed Instruction; *Program Evaluation; Safety

ABSTRACT

The report contains empirically-based evaluations of four adult basic education programed learning programs: How to Manage Your Money; Jobs; Looking Ahead in Life; and Safety. Measures of the amount learned from these programs indicate that, in general, they led to sufficient degrees of learning to justify their wider distribution to appropriate adult basic education students. More particularly, the Jobs and Safety programs led to relatively superior amounts of learning, while Money and Looking Ahead led to an adequate amount by previously established criteria. Students who used these programs and a sample of teachers for whom these programs are intended generally evaluated them favorably. The error rates for all programs were extremely low, indicating that the programs are successful by the error rate criterion. (Author/NH)

ED1035569

PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

AN EMPIRICALLY-BASED EVALUATION OF MATERIALS DEVELOPED BY THE ADULT LEARNING CENTER

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Field-Tested by the
Institute for Research on Human Behavior
P. O. Box 7512
Roanoke, Virginia

FINAL REPORT

ADULT LEARNING CENTER
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
AT RALEIGH

NOVEMBER, 1972

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education
Division of Adult Education Programs
Project No. 432028, Grant No. OEG-0-70-4599(324)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OE002930

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADULT LEARNING CENTER

The Adult Learning Center is an organizational unit in the School of Education at North Carolina State University, and is an integral part of the research and development program of the School of Education.

Established in 1967, the Center is committed to seeking new ways and means for facilitating the intellectual growth and development of adults. The multidisciplinary activities carried out by members of the University faculty associated with the Center are addressed to comprehensive and rigorous studies of the most pressing needs and problems confronting adult education. Among the objectives of the Center is the provision of national leadership in the development and implementation of experimental and demonstration projects which give promise of materially improving adult education programs. A major concern of the Center is the development and dissemination of packaged instructional materials and improved instructional methods which are capable of being institutionalized within operational adult education programs in public school systems.

The Center maintains on the campus of North Carolina State University an adult learning laboratory, the primary purpose of which is to further the use of programmed instructional materials among adults. Continuing research is conducted in the laboratory to determine the capacity of programmed instructional materials to effectively and efficiently raise the educational levels of adults.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For additional information regarding the Center, please write to:

Mr. D. Barry Lumsden, Director
Adult Learning Center
P. O. Box 5096
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

ED1035569

EMPIRICALLY-BASED EVALUATIONS OF:

1. HOW TO MANAGE YOUR MONEY

Money and Shopping (Unit I)

Your Spending Plan (Unit II)

Using Credit (Unit III)

2. JOBS

Major Sources of Job Information (Unit I)

How to Get in Touch with a Job (Unit II)

The Job Interview (Unit III)

3. LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE

4. SAFETY

Safety in the Home (Unit I)

How to Prevent Children's Accidents in the Home (Unit II)

Preventing Accidents of Older Adults in the Home (Unit III)

SUMMARY

Measures of the amount learned from these programs indicate that, in general, they led to sufficient degrees of learning to justify their wider distribution to appropriate adult basic education students. More particularly, JOBS and SAFETY lead to relatively superior amounts of learning, while MONEY and LOOKING AHEAD led to, approximately, an adequate amount by previously established criteria. The students who used these programs generally evaluated them favorably, though there were several relatively negative points in their evaluation forms. A sample of teachers for whom these programs are intended, including those for whom data are reported herein, generally evaluated the programs favorably, though there were some negative points in their opinions, too. The error rates for all programs were extremely low, indicating that the programs are successful by the error rate criterion.

In summary, these may be generally regarded as successful programs, especially by the major criterion for assessing effectiveness, viz., amount learned.*

---

*For details pertaining to the methodology employed to test the effectiveness of the programs discussed in the present report, the reader is referred to the publication by F. J. McGuigan and Robert J. Peters, Jr., entitled "Assessing the Effectiveness of Programmed Texts--Methodology and Some Findings" (available from the Adult Learning Center).

MONEY

Development Report

Consumer Education was selected early in the history of the project as a broad subject matter area appropriate to the needs of the under-educated adult. A set of concepts from which educational objectives could be written was developed by consultants from the Home Economics Division of the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service.

The summer of 1969, Mr. Robert G. Olsen joined the project from Wilmington College where he was an instructor of economics and business. Mr. Olsen's task was that of developing self-instructional materials in the area of consumer education. A review of the literature as a research project was made during the summer of 1969 in the areas of: the consumer behavior of the underprivileged; economic literacy programs in the self instructional format; consumer education for the undereducated adult and existing programs in consumer education. In the fall of 1969 Mr. Olsen began writing a program around the concept, "The Role of the Consumer in the Market Economy." Before this lesson was completed, Mr. Olsen was instructed to develop three linear programmed booklets on the basic tasks of shopping, making a spending plan, and using credit. These booklets were developed under the guidance of a consultant, Dr. Rex Reynolds, of the University of Chicago. Before the third booklet, "Money and Using Credit," had been initially tested, the Center employed another consultant in the area of educational technology, Dr. Barton Herrscher, of the Regional

Educational Laboratories for the Carolinas and Virginia. Money and Credit was completed using the systems approach proposed by the Regional Laboratories. The other booklets were revised by writing behavioral objectives internal to the booklets. Each of the original three booklets was tried out on a few students in the learning laboratory of the Adult Learning Center approximately three times prior to the first printing.

When more Center personnel were released to work in the area of consumer education, a survey was made to establish priorities for lesson development that helped somewhat in the validation process of the lessons. The lists of concepts were reduced to topics that could be identified by learners from the population, and the enrolled students were asked to work in them in order of importance to their needs along with suggested lesson topics. The only conceptual topic that approached those in the general area of money management, spending plans, shopping and using credit in ranking by students was that of insurance.

The content validation of the four units and the initial multiple choice achievement tests were established through consultation arranged by Dr. Mary Louise Collings with Mrs. Justine Rozier, Home Management Specialist, Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State University, and Dr. Jack Wilson, Associate Professor of Economics, North Carolina State University.

As a result of pre-testing, the achievement test called the "ALC Money Skills Test," was revised. This revised instrument was initially utilized as a pre- and posttest for the four units in the

field outside the learning laboratory within the Adult Learning Center.

The four units on MONEY were again revised and field-tested during the spring of 1971 (see Programmed Instructional Materials for Adult Basic Education: Interim Report, August, 1971). During the spring of 1972 the original four units were thoroughly revised again and condensed into a three unit series. Contained in the present report are the findings of the final revision and field test of the series.

JOBS

Developmental Report

Lessons on JOBS, subdivided into three units, represent sets of micro-concepts in the area of the adult work world. The lessons were written for adults capable of reading at the fifth grade level. The original set of sub-concepts was selected by Dr. Don Reynolds who in 1968 was an outside consultant to the Adult Learning Center. Dr. Reynolds' original material was subdivided into five separate segments, each of which was presented in a programmed instructional format.

The materials were received by the project staff and revised in 1969 and 1970. The revised edition reflects a (1) reorganization of the concepts, (2) a conceptual outline, and a (3) sequence of objectives. These are included in a separate booklet entitled Instructor's Manual. In addition, a pre- and posttest is included for each of the three separate units.

All three units of JOBS were empirically evaluated during the spring of 1971. The results of the field test indicated the need for further revision before the materials were released for national distribution and use (see Programmed Instructional Materials for Adult Basic Education: Interim Report, August, 1971).

During the spring of 1972 the series was again revised based upon the findings of the earlier field test. Contained in the present report are the research-based findings of the second, and final, field test.

PERSONAL AND FAMILY GOALS (LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE)

Developmental Report

This instructional unit represents a set of micro-concepts in the area of home management as originally identified by a number of consultants to the Adult Learning Center in 1967.

A conceptual outline and schema of objectives for the unit were developed in 1968. The materials were developed further through the assistance of Mrs. Minnie Brown and her staff from the Home Economics Division of the North Carolina State University Agricultural Extension Service in 1968.

Programmed frames were developed from the set of objectives by the members of the staff of the Adult Learning Center. The first edition appropriate for adult basic education learners was prepared with illustrations in 1969. This edition was reviewed by the project staff and subsequently revised during the summer and fall of 1970 to include a pre- and posttest. The instructor's manual was included in the first edition.

PERSONAL AND FAMILY GOALS was field-tested during the spring of 1971 and found to be in need of further revision (see Programmed Instructional Materials for Adult Basic Education: Interim Report, August, 1971). The materials were revised and further tested for effectiveness during the spring of 1972. The research-based findings of the final field testing are included in the present report. The original PERSONAL AND FAMILY GOALS series has undergone a title change and is referred to in this report as LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE.

EMPIRICALLY BASED EVALUATIONS OF

ADULT LEARNING CENTER PROGRAMS

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

MONEY (Three booklets entitled Money and Shopping, Your Spending Plan and Using Credit)

Purpose:	This series is designed to facilitate money management for low income families.
Length:	The three units have a total of 71 frames.
Students' Study Time:	An average of 21 minutes per booklet, with a range of 15 minutes to 30 minutes.
Reading Ease Score:*	88.76 = Easy. 5th grade level.
Human Interest Score:**	41.18 = Highly Interesting.

JOBS (Three booklets entitled Major Sources of Job Information, How to Get in Touch with a Job, and The Job Interview)

Purpose:	The course of study on JOBS was written for those adult students who plan to seek a first job, or those presently employed but who may wish to acquire understanding in how to find out about job information, how to make job contacts, and how to successfully interview for a job.
Length:	The three units involve 133 frames.
Students' Study Time:	An average of 26 minutes per booklet, with a range of 15 minutes to 35 minutes.
Reading Ease Score:*	94.62 = Very Easy. 4th grade level.
Human Interest Score:**	46.83 = Highly Interesting.

*Rudolf Flesch, The Art of Readable Writing (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1949), p. 149.

**Ibid., p. 151.

LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE

Purpose:	To provide a family with a basic knowledge of home management and to help it meet family and personal goals.
Length:	The unit involves 40 frames.
Students' Study Time:	An average of 33 minutes, with a range of 30 minutes to 35 minutes.
Reading Ease Score:*	90.86 = Very Easy. 4th grade level.
Human Interest Score:**	47.13 = Highly Interesting.

SAFETY

Purpose:	To provide adults who manage, or assist in the management of, a home with an understanding of how to make their home a safe place to live.
Length:	The three units involve 152 frames.
Students' Study Time:	An average of 50 minutes per unit, with a range of 20 minutes to 125 minutes.
Reading Ease Score:*	92.44 = Very Interesting. 4th grade level.
Human Interest Score:**	56.07 = Highly Interesting.

TESTING CIRCUMSTANCES

SUBJECTS AND LOCATIONS: The subject characteristics are summarized as follows:

Location	N	Mean Age	Age Range	Mean Highest Grade Completed	Gender	Source of Subjects	Mean Reading Level and Range	I.Q.
Durham #1	7	27	21-41	10.0	Female	Win. Program	8.3 6-10	92
Durham #2	7	17	16-18	8.6	12 Females 1 Male	NYC Program	6.8 3.9-12.5	--

*Rudolf Flesch, The Art of Readable Writing (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1949), p. 149.

**Ibid., p. 151.

DATES OF TESTING: August 1972 to October 1972.

TESTING PROCEDURE: The students were given an achievement test as a pre-test and then studied at their own rate in the program. A record of working time was kept. They took the posttest when they had finished their programs, at which time they and the teachers completed standard program evaluation forms. The teachers did not assist the students in other than procedural matters.

RESULTS

1. LEARNING DATA:

The achievement test scores for each program are presented in Tables 1 - 10. It may be seen, for instance, that the mean pre-test score for Major Sources of Job Information at the Durham #1 location was 3.95. After completing the program the students had a mean score of 6.90; the gain was thus 2.95. The amount learned, as measured by the test, was large, relative to the amount that could have been learned, i.e., the ratio of the gain to the amount of possible gain was .73 (the G-Ratio)*. Using the standard G-Ratio of .50 as the standard indicative of sufficient learning, it can be seen that at Durham #1, Unit #1 of JOBS led to adequate learning. This finding is in accord with those at Durham #2.

Learning data for the other two units of JOBS may be similarly studied in Tables 2 and 3, where it may be seen that both classes learned substantially, as indicated by mean G-Ratios that well exceeded .50.

The G values for the first unit of MONEY approached an indication of a sufficient amount of learning (Table 4). A very high G value resulted for Unit 2 at Durham #1, though it was less at Durham #2 (Table 5), the mean of these two values exceeding .50. Similarly, on the average, Unit #3 was successful by a learning criterion. We may thus conclude that JOBS may lead to a satisfactory amount of learning.

*The criterion of .50 has been standard in previous work, and has been empirically justified in tests of programmed and non-programmed materials, c.f., McGuigan, F. J. "How to Select and Evaluate Programmed Instructional Materials," Adult Learning Center Occasional Paper #1, North Carolina State University, April, 1971.

Table 1

Learning Data for Major Sources

of Job Information
(Unit I)

(Possible Test Score = 8)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	3.95	6.90	2.95	.73
Durham #2	6	1.95	5.23	3.28	.54

Table 2

Learning Data for How to

Get In Touch With a Job
(Unit II)

(Possible Test Score = 9)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	3.00	7.43	4.43	.74
Durham #2	6	1.67	6.42	4.75	.65

Table 3

Learning Data for the Job Interview
(Unit III)

(Possible Test Score = 9)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	5.71	7.86	2.15	.65
Durham #2	6	2.50	6.17	3.67	.56

Table 4

Learning Data for Money and Shopping
(Unit I)

(Possible Test Score 10)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	6.29	8.00	1.71	.46
Durham #2	7	4.71	6.86	2.15	.41

Table 5

Learning Data for Your Spending Plan
(Unit II)

(Possible Test Score 7)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Dur'am #1	7	2.14	6.21	4.07	.84
Du:'ham #2	7	2.29	3.86	1.57	.33

Table 6

Learning Data for Using Credit
(Unit III)

(Possible Test Score 13)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	7.71	11.00	3.29	.62
Durham #2	6	4.75	8.50	3.75	.45

The learning results for SAFETY are presented in Tables 7-9. There we can see that the G values for Units 1 and 2 clearly exceeded .50, but that a low value resulted for Unit 3 at Durham #1. Nevertheless, the general conclusion is that the three units of SAFETY led, on the average, to a sufficient amount of learning.

The results for LOOKING AHEAD closely approximate the criterion of an adequate amount of learning (Table 10).

2. STUDENT EVALUATIONS:

The student reactions are presented in Tables 11-14 along with the reactions of other students who used 39 programs that have been previously tested. In this way the students' evaluations of these programs may be compared with a "norm" group. For example, Question #4 asks, "How much do you think you learned from this program?" We can see that 18% of the students who used the 39 various other programs indicated that they "learned very much." In comparison 43% of those at Durham #1 who used MONEY said that they "learned very much," while 14% of them said that they "learned quite a bit." Detailed study of Tables 11-14 suggests that the students who studied these programs favorably evaluated them, though there are several relatively negative points.

3. TEACHER EVALUATIONS:

A sample of teachers for whom these programs were intended generally considered their contents sound, and the levels appropriate for their students, though two of four thought that SAFETY was too easy (Table 15). The amount that could be accomplished was, in general, rated somewhat unfavorably in their opinion. The attitudes of the teachers toward programming were favorable, as can be seen in Item #4. Perhaps of most importance, the programs should be made nationally available, they generally thought (Item 6). In summary, we can regard the teachers' evaluations as generally, though not overwhelmingly, favorable. Specific comments offered by the teachers are as follows:

HOW TO MANAGE YOUR MONEY: "ABE students are already familiar with this type of information."

"The material is good and interesting. After each unit it should be discussed. Here we could check words and their meanings."

"Strong points:

1. Practical and useful information
2. Gave opportunity for students to plan their own budget.
3. Vocabulary was easy to understand.

Weak points:

1. Insufficient explanation for figuring income and outgo of examples in Unit II - Your Spending Plan."

"Best of 4 programs - did offer a few points, especially credit, Again, too elementary.

JOBS: "Strong points:

1. The program gave useful information
2. Listing of programs in job training in Unit I.
3. Gave information on exactly where to go for help, pointers on how to be successful in job contacts.
4. The discussion of 'Me Attitude' versus 'You Attitude' was a good topic to include. More discussion and examples should have been included on it.

Weak points:

1. Did not list exactly what students would have to know about themselves in order to fill out an application, such as dates they attended schools, social security number, names and addresses of references, etc. A sample application blank could have been included in one of the Units."

"Too juvenile - merely common sense and inappropriate for adults."

"This program is fine. It gives the student an opportunity to be fair or cheat. To learn or not. He can correct his own mistakes. We should review or discuss the subjects because they are so important."

"ABE students are already familiar with this type material - is more applicable for teen-aged students."

LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE:

"Strong points:
1. Well-organized material
2. Material that will help students understand themselves better.

Weak points:
1. Vocabulary not explained sufficiently
2. Needed more examples of terms such as values, resources, goals."

"Simply common sense - no challenge."

SAFETY:

"ABE students already are familiar with this material - more applicable for students in teens."

"No challenge - a repetition of common knowledge."

"Strong points:
1. Practical information needed for everyday living.
2. Clear, precise, easy to follow instructions for safety.
3. Drawings were used to aid explanation - this was very helpful.

Weak points:
1. Too repetitious. The subject matter was one that did not need that much repetition."

4. ERROR ANALYSIS:

It was determined that the mean error rates were 1.5% for JOBS, .13% for LOOKING AHEAD, 1.0% for SAFETY, and 1.9% for MONEY. A frequency distribution of error rates for 39 previously tested programs is presented in McGuigan (op. cit.). Relatively, all four programs under test here had extremely low error rates. It may thus be concluded that these are successful programs by the error rate criterion.

Table 7

Learning Data for Safety in the Home
(Unit 1)

(Possible Test Score 15)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	8.90	13.43	4.53	.74
Durham #2	7	6.50	11.64	5.14	.60

Table 8

Learning Data for How to Prevent

Children's Accidents in the Home
(Unit II)

(Possible Test Score 10)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	7.64	9.29	1.65	.70
Durham #2	7	6.36	8.93	2.57	.71

Table 9

Learning Data on Preventing Accidents

of Older Adults in the Home
(Unit III)

(Possible Test Score 8)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	6.14	6.57	.43	.23
Durham #2	6	5.00	6.50	1.50	.50

Table 10

Learning Data on Looking Ahead in Life

(Possible Test Score 10)

Test Location	N	Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Gain	G-Ratio
Durham #1	7	1.64	5.54	3.90	.47
Durham #2	5	2.00	5.75	3.75	.47

Table 11

Student Evaluations of MONEY

Question #1: Because a program was used in this course I believe:

Test Location	N	I learned more	It made no difference	I learned less
39 Programs	1870	70%	18%	12%
Durham #1	7	86%	14%	0%
Durham #2	5	60%	20%	20%

Question #2: In comparing work done using the program with studying in regular textbooks I feel that with the same amount of time and effort:

Test Location	N	I learned much more with the program	I learned somewhat more with the program	There is no difference	I learned somewhat more from studying textbooks	I learned much more from studying textbooks
39 programs	1869	30%	39%	7%	15%	9%
Durham #1	7	29%	28%	0%	43%	0%
Durham #2	5	0%	40%	0%	40%	20%

Question #3: If I were to take another course in this subject, or a similar field, I would:

Test Location	N	Prefer to have programs used for at least part of the course	Not care whether programs were used or not	Prefer not to have programs used
39 programs	1866	64%	14%	22%
Durham #1	7	57%	29%	14%
Durham #2	5	60%	0%	40%

Question #4: How much do you think you learned from this program:

Test Location	N	Learned nothing	Learned a little	Learned a medium amount	Learned quite a bit	Learned very much
39 programs	1870	2%	15%	31%	34%	18%
Durham #1	7	0%	0%	43%	14%	43%
Durham #2	5	20%	0%	60%	20%	0%

Question #5: To what extent did you enjoy going through this program?

Test Location	N	Very unenjoyable	Unenjoyable	50-50	Enjoyable	Very enjoyable
39 programs	1871	3%	11%	40%	27%	19%
Durham #1	7	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%
Durham #2	5	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%

Question #6: To what extent was the program repetitious?

Test Location	N	Much too repetitious	Too repetitious	Moderately repetitious	Slightly repetitious	Not at all repetitious
39 programs	1862	7%	17%	41%	26%	9%
Durham #1	5	20%	0%	60%	20%	0%
Durham #2	5	40%	20%	20%	20%	0%

Table 12

Student Evaluations of JOBS

Question #1: Because a program was used in this course I believe:

Test Location	N	I learned more	It made no difference	I learned less
39 programs	1870	70%	18%	12%
Durham #1	7	71%	29%	0%
Durham #2	6	67%	33%	0%

Question #2: In comparing work done using the program with studying in regular textbooks I feel that with the same amount of time and effort:

Test Location	N	I learned much more with the program	I learned somewhat more with the program	There is no difference	I learned somewhat more from studying textbooks	I learned much more from studying textbooks
39 programs	1869	30%	39%	7%	15%	9%
Durham #1	7	57%	0%	15%	14%	14%
Durham #2	6	33%	17%	33%	0%	17%

Question #3: If I were to take another course in this subject, or a similar field, I would:

Test Location	N	Prefer to have programs used for at least part of the course	Not care whether programs were used or not	Prefer not to have programs used
39 programs	1866	64%	14%	22%
Durham #1	7	43%	29%	28%
Durham #2	6	50%	33%	17%

Question #4: How much do you think you learned from this program?

Test Location	N	Learned nothing	Learned a little	Learned a medium amount	Learned quite a bit	Learned very much
39 programs	1870	2%	15%	31%	34%	18%
Durham #1	7	0%	14%	29%	29%	28%
Durham #2	6	33%	17%	17%	33%	0%

Question #5: To what extent did you enjoy going through this program:

Test Location	N	Very unenjoyable	Unenjoyable	50-50	Enjoyable	Very enjoyable
39 programs	1871	3%	11%	40%	27%	19%
Durham #1	7	15%	0%	57%	14%	14%
Durham #2	6	17%	0%	33%	50%	0%

Question #6: To what extent was the program repetitious?

Test Location	N	Much too repeti-tious	Too repeti-tious	Moderately repeti-tious	Slightly repeti-tious	Not at all repeti-tious
39 programs	1862	7%	17%	41%	26%	9%
Durham #1	5	40%	0%	0%	40%	20%
Durham #2	6	50%	17%	17%	16%	0%

Table 13

Student Evaluations of Looking Ahead in Life

Question #1: Because a program was used in this course I believe:

Test Location	N	I learned more	It made no difference	I learned less
39 programs	1870	70%	18%	12%
Durham #1	7	86%	14%	0%
Durham #2	6	67%	33%	0%

Question #2: In comparing work done using the program with studying in regular textbooks I feel that with the same amount of time and effort:

Test Location	N	I learned much more with the program	I learned somewhat more with the program	There is no difference	I learned somewhat more from studying textbooks	I learned much more from studying textbooks
39 programs	1869	30%	39%	7%	15%	9%
Durham #1	7	29%	43%	14%	0%	14%
Durham #2	6	34%	33%	0%	33%	0%

Question #3: If I were to take another course in this subject, or a similar field, I would:

Test Location	N	Prefer to have programs used for at least part of the course	Not care whether programs were used or not	Prefer not to have programs used
39 programs	1866	64%	14%	22%
Durham #1	7	57%	29%	14%
Durham #2	6	67%	17%	16%

Question #4: How much do you think you learned from this program?

Test Location	N	Learned nothing	Learned a little	Learned a medium amount	Learned quite a bit	Learned very much
39 programs	1870	2%	15%	31%	34%	18%
Durham #1	7	14%	0%	29%	43%	14%
Durham #2	6	0%	50%	0%	33%	17%

Question #5: To what extent did you enjoy going through this program?

Test Location	N	Very unenjoyable	Unenjoyable	50-50	Enjoyable	Very enjoyable
39 programs	1871	3%	11%	40%	27%	19%
Durham #1	7	0%	29%	43%	28%	0%
Durham #2	6	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%

Question #6: To what extent was the program repetitious?

Test Location	N	Much too repetitious	Too repetitious	Moderately repetitious	Slightly repetitious	Not at all repetitious
39 programs	1862	7%	17%	41%	26%	9%
Durham #1	6	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
Durham #2	6	33%	17%	33%	17%	0%

Table 14

Student Evaluations of Safety in the Home
(Unit I)

Question #1: Because a program was used in this course I believe:

Test Location	N	I learned more	It made no difference	I learned less
39 programs	1870	70%	18%	12%
Durham #1	7	57%	29%	14%
Durham #2	6	83%	17%	0%

Question #2: In comparing work done using the program with studying in regular textbooks I feel that with the same amount of time and effort:

Test Location	N	I learned much more with the program	I learned somewhat more with the program	There is no difference	I learned somewhat more from studying textbooks	I learned much more from studying textbooks
39 programs	1869	30%	39%	7%	15%	9%
Durham #1	7	14%	29%	57%	0%	0%
Durham #2	6	33%	50%	0%	0%	17%

Question #3: If I were to take another course in this subject, or a similar field, I would:

Test Location	N	Prefer to have programs used for at least part of the course	Not care whether programs were used or not	Prefer not to have programs used
39 programs	1866	64%	14%	22%
Durham #1	7	14%	57%	29%
Durham #2	6	67%	33%	0%

Question #4: How much do you think you learned from this program?

Test Location	N	Learned nothing	Learned a little	Learned a medium amount	Learned quite a bit	Learned very much
39 programs	1870	2%	15%	31%	34%	18%
Durham #1	7	29%	14%	57%	0%	0%
Durham #2	6	0%	16%	0%	67%	17%

Question #5: To what extent did you enjoy going through this program?

Test Location	N	Very enjoyable	Unenjoyable	50-50	Enjoyable	Very enjoyable
39 programs	1871	3%	11%	40%	27%	19%
Durham #1	7	29%	43%	28%	0%	0%
Durham #2	6	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%

Question #6: To what extent was the program repetitious?

Test Location	N	Much too repeti-tious	Too repeti-tious	Moderately repeti-tious	Slightly repeti-tious	Not at all repeti-tious
39 programs	1862	7%	17%	41%	26%	9%
Durham #1	7	43%	14%	0%	29%	14%
Durham #2	6	0%	0%	34%	33%	33%

Table 15

Summary of Teacher Evaluations*

Program Title	1. Sound Content?			2. Level of Content?			3. Amount Accomplished?				
	Yes	No	Undecided	Too hard	Appropriate	Too easy	Great deal more	Little more	Equal	Little less	Much less
MONEY	5	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	4	0
JOBS	4	0	1	0	4	1	0	1	1	3	0
LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	2	1
SAFETY IN THE HOME	3	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	3	0

	4. Program Preference?			5. Program Enjoyable to Teacher?				
	Preferred	Not preferred	Don't care	Very unenjoyable	Unenjoyable	50-50	Enjoyable	Very Enjoyable
MONEY	3	1	1	0	2	2	0	1
JOBS	3	1	1	0	1	2	2	0
LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0
SAFETY IN THE HOME	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	0

	6. Should It Be Nationally Available?		
	Yes	No	Don't know
MONEY	4	0	1
JOBS	2	0	3
LOOKING AHEAD IN LIFE	2	1	1
SAFETY IN THE HOME	2	1	1

*See the Appendix for a complete statement of questions in Table 15.

APPENDIX

Teacher Rating Form

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Title of Program_____ Name of Teacher_____

The following questions were designed to help us evaluate the program that you have just gone through with your class. The information that you can furnish will be of great value to us. For each question please check the blank that you feel most adequatel; describes your opinion. Blank lines have been provided below each question for you to qualify or elaborate your answers. Please feel free to make any comments that will aid us in determining the value of this program.

1. Is the subject-matter of the program academically sound:

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Undecided

Comments: _____

_____

_____

2. Is the level of the subject matter appropriate for your class?

_____ Too difficult

_____ Appropriate

_____ Too easy

Comments: _____

_____

_____

3. As contrasted with what you are able to accomplish with other types of learning material, how much do you feel you are able to get your pupils to learn with this program?

_____ A great deal more than with most other materials.

_____ A little more than with most other materials.

_____ About as much as with other materials.

_____ A little less than with most other materials.

_____ So little as to be a waste of time.

Comments: _____

_____

_____

4. The next time you teach a course in this subject or a similar field, would you:

_____ Prefer to have programs used for at least part of the course?

_____ Prefer not to have programs used?

_____ Not care whether programs are used or not?

Comments: _____

_____

_____

5. To what extent is this program enjoyable for your class?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Very Enjoyable	Unenjoyable	50-50	Enjoyable	Very Enjoyable

Comments: _____

_____

_____